

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addeas: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upub.gov.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/722,973	11/26/2003	Kelly Ann Mohr	144761	9045	
John S. Beulic	7590 06/25/200	EXAM	EXAMINER		
Armstrong Tea		KISH, JAMES M			
Suite 2600 One Metropoli	tan Souare	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
St. Louis, MO		3737			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/25/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/722,973	MOHR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES KISH	3737	

	JAMES KISH	3737					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	l ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 27 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App</li> </ol>	he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this pplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the splication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request or Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) \(\sumeq\) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In on event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner hole: If box 1 is checked, check bither box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO.							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below). They are not deemed to place the application in belappeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	he issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al  non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1.4-11.13-17 and 19-24.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	theface and the date of Class - No.		the entrand				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
/BRIAN CASLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737	/James Kish/ Examiner, Art Unit 3737						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the prior art fails to the teach the claims as amended. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The amendments of "wherein the generate volume excludes a plurality of papillary muscles" does not read over the prior art. As Kanebako's images used for volume determination are created from contrast medium images via thresholding and edge detection, it is obvious that this would be an outline of the accordance the contrast medium would be in the patient's blood, thereby providing contrast for the cavity of the ventricle. Furthermore, it is unclear which papillary muscles are excluded. Therefore, some papillary muscles may be included while certain other papillary muscles may be included while certain other papillary muscles or any be excluded. For this reason, the prior art may still show some papillary muscles and read on the claims. It would be obvious for the images to not show appillary muscles causes Sheehan teaches that some anatomical andrawfars may be used for bordetermination. As long two papillary muscles do not show up in the image, then Sheehan (and Kanebako) reads on the claims. It would be obvious to only include the important anatomical features required for a diagnosis in the images, which in certain circumstances would expellary muscles. This would minimize required processing power and decrease the processing time. Furthermore, Sheehan teaches the option of manual tracing of these borders, and it would be obvious to evudued papillary muscles.